

CROTCHETS IN THE HOUSE.

A LONG-WINDED AND VALUELESS DEBATE BY OBSCURE MEN.

LETTERS ON THE FISHERY QUESTION—RUNNING THE JUBILEE BUSINESS INTO THE GROUND—MR. HERKIMER'S VIEWS OF AMERICAN ART—MR. MORGAN'S GIFT—PERSONAL NOTES.

Copyright, 1887. North American Cable News Co.
LONDON, Feb. 17.—Serious questions having been disposed of for the present with the rejection of Mr. Parnell's amendment, the crotchets have taken the field in Parliament, and the week has been devoted to airing the notions of Mr. Parnell, Mr. Cameron and Mr. Herkimer, Mr. Eslemont, an ambitious Aberdonian dry-goods merchant who sits for East Aberdonshire, appeared as the champion of the Scotch leasclanders. He wants the agricultural leases revised because the prices of produce have fallen. This is a good enough illustration of the extent to which men's business consciences have been debauched by the doctrines lately preached. Mr. Eslemont thinks that a contract freely entered into may be broken by the party who finds it unprofitable; but the House of Commons thought not, by over a hundred majority. Mr. Campbell submitted an amendment looking like Home Rule for Scotland, which was vaguely discussed and then withdrawn. Not discouraged by this, Mr. Cameron wanted the House to ensure the police and other authorities who have enforced the law against dissenters. Sundry Scotchmen with crofter constituents supported him, notably Mr. Hunter, Mr. Barclay and other extreme Radicals. Yesterday the House by 117 majority negatived this naive proposal for allowing poor people to break the law because they are poor.

The end of this endless debate seems as distant as ever. Mr. Gladstone's significant absence fails to cool the zeal of his followers and allies. The Irish members are now credited with a resolve to protract the discussion till the Dublin trials are finished, and they are strongly backed by numerous Liberals under Sir William Vernon Harcourt's lead, who do not shrink from challenging a Parliamentary inquiry into judicial proceedings which are still unfinished. The Gladstonian press has taken up the cry of jury packing at Dublin for political purposes. They already announce that trial by jury is reduced to a farce and that a verdict against Mr. Dillon, if obtained, will have no weight.

Mr. Gladstone is reported to be occupying his leisure at Haverdon in writing a review of the Greville Memoirs for the next "Nineteenth Century."

The true character of the singular series of letters in "The Times" on the Canadian fisheries dispute is at last disclosed. The writer began with an affectation of impartiality, or perhaps of friendliness toward America, and the first letter, purporting to state the question at issue, was dated at New-York. The second letter, professing to set out the American case, was dated at Boston. The third letter, which appears to-day, arguing the Canadian side, reveals the writer in his real colors, and thinking it useless to keep the flag flying any longer he dates the communication at St. John, New-Brunswick. It is difficult to say why "The Times" should lend itself to a superchery of this sort.

The papers to-day publish long accounts of yesterday's Jubilee celebration in India, which are not without interest, especially to the lucky persons who received new Indian titles in what the Queen quaintly styles "The Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire," which includes both English and natives. But cool heads are beginning to see that the Jubilee business is in imminent danger of being overdone. "The Standard" declares that the public seems temporarily to have lost control of its reason, enumerates many absurd proposals, explains how people are seizing the opportunity to advertise themselves and their business, and boldly points to the attempt of the Bishops to use the Jubilee as a means of collecting money for a clerical club as the most conspicuous example of this mercantile spirit. Some zealous and admirable women, I may add, not satisfied with the Women's Subscription, now being pushed into every hamlet in the Kingdom, have issued an appeal for a children's Jubilee tribute. The Duchess of St. Albans, the Duchess of Argyll, Lady Hayter, Mrs. Jeune, Lady Wolsey and many other less distinguished ornaments of London society, sign this appeal. Local enterprises of every sort multiply. Every Mayor in England fully expects knighthood as his reward for erecting a Jubilee pump or Jubilee baths. The public began some time since to murmur at the frequency of these fresh taxes, many of which fall on the poorest people.

The appointment of the Earl of Onslow, whose American visit you can hardly have forgotten, to succeed the Earl of Dufferin as Under Secretary for the Colonies, occasions some criticism. The Liberals thought they had a chance of electing him into the Liberal ranks. It is inferred from his acceptance of the office that Lord Salisbury means to radicalize his land programme for England.

Mr. Hubert Herkimer's experience in America, which is understood to have been profitable to him, has left him with but a poor notion of the state of art in that country. He speaks with some respect of American architecture, of which he considers the late Mr. H. H. Richardson to have been the guiding genius. But he thinks that art in the sense of painting has not much hold there, albeit the best work done lately by European art schools is by Americans. He discusses Mr. Morgan's picture as like a fresh breeze coming from the Royal Academy; which were. But alas! it will take a long time in the opinion of Professor Herkimer for art to become a real thing in America. There are captious Englishmen who have even questioned the reality of Mr. Herkimer's own art.

A well known photographer of London has been telling a "Pall Mall Gazette" interviewer that Americans are among the largest buyers of portraits of royalties; and adds the melancholy intelligence that photographs of Miss Mary Anderson, of which once they could hardly print enough, are no longer in demand. Miss Anderson's reappearance next autumn at the Lyceum Theatre, however, will surely be signalled by the reappearance of her photographs in every window.

Mr. J. S. Morgan's offer of \$50,000 to Guy's Hospital puts all English gifts to this object in the shade. The managers of Guy's Hospital asked some months ago for \$500,000 as absolutely necessary for the maintenance of one of the noblest charities of London. Less than half that sum has been raised, though the Queen, the Prince of Wales, the Rothschilds and many others have supported the scheme. Mr. Morgan's gift is conditional on the completion of the amount by May and will probably result in obtaining the whole sum.

The Earl and Countess of Aberdeen, now in India, have decided to visit the United States on their way home. They take Australia en route, stopping in Tasmania to see Sir Robert Hamilton, lately Under Secretary at Dublin, and leave Sydney on April 21 by a steamer due at San Francisco on May 10. Their stay in America will, however, be very short, as they must arrive in England by the middle of June for the Jubilee. They probably will go direct from San Francisco to New-York, only breaking the journey to meet relatives in the West. It is needless to

remind you of Lord Aberdeen's remarkable success, when Viceroy of Ireland, in winning Irish sympathies, or of Lady Aberdeen's admirable co-operation with her husband. G. W. S.

IS RUDDIGORE A SUCCESS?

WHAT MANAGER D'OLY CARTE HAS TO SAY.

Copyright, 1887. North American Cable News Co.

LONDON, Feb. 17.—The subject of the first week of the season, "Ruddigore," which explains itself, will just at this time be of interest to lovers of opera music. Sir My New-York Opera Company is now on the Ettruria, due to arrive on Saturday or Sunday next, and will perform the new opera of "Ruddigore" before an American audience next week. I see that many of the New-York journals state that the piece was not a success here. This may be due to the fact that on the first night, just before the end, there was a few latecomers, and the effect of the piece was marred by the latecomers. The piece, however, is a good one, and the latecomers are a small number. The piece is a good one, and the latecomers are a small number. The piece is a good one, and the latecomers are a small number.

The only means I have of deciding whether a production has been a success or not is the expression of the public opinion. I do not wish to bias the verdict of the New-York people, but I do desire that they shall come to see the piece free from any incorrect impression to its disadvantage. I therefore ask to be allowed to state the following simple facts: The receipts for the first two weeks of "Ruddigore" were \$127,463.50 in excess of those for the corresponding period of "The Mikado." The first week of "Ruddigore" was taken at the box office for advanced booking as against \$120,609.64 in the corresponding period of "The Mikado." Since then, despite the great drawback of Mr. Grossmuth's continual absence, the takings have run level. The theatre is crammed nightly; there are actual fourteen encores, and the artists are always called before the curtain. The figures speak for themselves.

R. D'OLY CARTE.

RUN DOWN BY A MAN-OF-WAR.

THE BURGUNDIA'S SIDE BROKEN IN.

—334 PASSENGERS ON BOARD.

LONDON, Feb. 17.—The French steamer Burgundia, while leaving Naples for New-York with 334 passengers on board, was struck amidships by the spur of the man-of-war Italia and was so badly damaged that the captain beached her to prevent her sinking. The main and after holds are full of water.

The Burgundia is a screw steamer of 1,848 tons burden. She is owned by Cyren, Fabre & Co., of Marseilles, France, and was built at Liverpool in 1882 by Royden & Sons.

ARRESTS ON THE GERMAN FRONTIER.

BISMARCK SURE OF A VICTORY AND THE POPE OF PEACE.

PARIS, Feb. 17.—Arrests continue in German frontier towns of persons suspected of being in the confidence of M. Dronowski. The police are seizing copies of a pictorial brochure entitled "Bismarck's Nightmare," which has lately been hawked on the boulevards.

The Vatican has been informed that Prince Bismarck is sure of a majority in the new Reichstag. The paper adds that when the Pope received this information he was so pleased that he ordered a special Mass to be said for the success of the German Government.

ST. PETERSBURG, Feb. 17.—It is semi-officially stated that the relations between Austria and Russia are so much improved that it is no longer expected that Austria would make a Russian occupation of Bulgaria a *casus belli*.

BELLEVILLE, Feb. 17.—The North German Gazette publishes a letter from Barcelona containing the reports that large purchases of horses for the French Government are being made in Spain. The same paper asserts that sheep dealers of the Palatinato and of Alsace-Lorraine who supply France largely with mutton are at present busily engaged in buying all the sheep obtainable in the vicinity of Schweinfurt on the Main, in Bavaria.

The same paper referring to the statement contained in the election placards issued by the Opposition, is asserting that the Government intends in the event of securing a majority in the new Reichstag to introduce a monopoly bill, measures extending military service to seven years, an act to suspend universal suffrage, and even a bill to suspend the constitution, says that Prince Bismarck, commenting thereon, has declared that "the political well-poisoning which the enemies of the empire have promulgated, and which the Government intends to prolong the anti-socialist law, are senseless inventions. The Chancellor adds that if the elections are held, he believes that the Government has such evil designs, then they cannot be protected from unscrupulous sharpers."

The North German Gazette says: The Liberal press continues to circulate *untrue* reports of the falsehood that Europe lives in a state of anarchy, and that the Government intends to prolong the anti-socialist law, are senseless inventions. The Chancellor adds that if the elections are held, he believes that the Government has such evil designs, then they cannot be protected from unscrupulous sharpers."

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC BLOCKADE.

TRAINS STOPPED BY SNOW AND LAND-SLIDES.—"DEAD" ENGINES ABANDONED IN DRIFTS.

MONTREAL, Feb. 17 (Special).—The Canadian Pacific Railway has been completely blocked with snow for the past three weeks. It has been impossible to obtain exact information in regard to the extent of the obstruction, for very few trains have been running. The management of the road, however, has been able to ascertain that the road west of Winnipeg has been blocked for twenty-three days and especially in the Selkirk and district of Calgary. The snow sheds there have failed to afford protection in consequence of heavy land-slides which have demolished them in several places. The portion of the road running through the Fraser River valley is blocked by snow and rocky landslides. For some time the Fraser River has been frozen up at the mouth so that vessels could not reach Vancouver Island. To add to the difficulties of the company, the supply of coal at many points has been exhausted, and the management has been forced to resort to the use of kerosene. It is reported that a large number of "dead" engines have been abandoned in the Selkirk region and on both sides of it. General Macleod, who is at the head of the road, is expected to arrive there yesterday. He started with a party of engineers to examine the road, and he is expected to arrive there yesterday. He started with a party of engineers to examine the road, and he is expected to arrive there yesterday. He started with a party of engineers to examine the road, and he is expected to arrive there yesterday.

BEATEN BY MUTINOUS PAUPERS.

DUBLIN, Feb. 17.—The paupers at the New Ross Workhouse yesterday broke into the council chamber of the Poor Law Guardians while that body was in session and pelted them with various missiles. The master of the workhouse received a severe beating from the assailants. The police were powerless to prevent the outrage. Reinforcements have been summoned to their assistance. The paupers are still mutinous and are holding the workhouse against the authorities.

FRAGMENTS OF CABLE NEWS.

ROME, Feb. 17.—Cardinal Jacobini now desires to retain the office of papal secretary. The final decision as to his successor has been postponed until the next conclave.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Feb. 17.—It is stated that Herr von Roderer, the German minister to the Porte, has informed the Turkish Government that in the event of the failure to settle the Bulgarian question by the negotiations pending in London, he will occupy Bulgaria, with the consent of Germany and Austria.

ITALIAN FORCES IN THE ROUDAN.

SEKIN, Feb. 17.—Advices from Masowah say that 800 Italian troops, with Gatling guns, landed there on February 15, and that 2,000 more men were expected. The Italians have raised a corps of 1,000 Baschi Baskas and have armed the inhabitants of Masowah. Rasula has gone to meet the King of Abyssinia, who is displeased with the Italian occupation of the country. The Italian forces have been ordered to leave Masowah to arrange for the ransom of the Italian prisoners, who have started on their return to the Abyssinian camp, provided with funds.

A SUBSTANTIAL TORY VICTORY.

THE IRISH QUESTION VOTED DOWN IN THE COMMONS.

THE GOVERNMENT NOT TO SHOW ITS HAND UNTIL THE RULES OF PROCEDURE ARE CONSIDERED.

LONDON, Feb. 17.—In the House of Commons to-day W. H. Smith moved that the discussion of the rules of procedure have precedence over all orders of the day. He said that the prolonged debate on the day of the day had become prolix. It was now the sixteenth day of the debate, and he said it was necessary to bring it to a close. He said that the Government had no objection to the discussion of the rules of procedure, but that it was necessary to bring it to a close. He said that the Government had no objection to the discussion of the rules of procedure, but that it was necessary to bring it to a close.

Mr. William Vernon Harcourt said the Opposition did not desire to place obstacles in the way of the progress of business. He hoped the matter of procedure would not be made a party question.

Mr. Labouchere objected to giving a blank check of this sort to the Government, thereby permitting them to do as they pleased. He said that the Government was not to be allowed to do as they pleased. He said that the Government was not to be allowed to do as they pleased.

Mr. Parnell asked the Government to concede time to discuss his proposal for admitting Irish farmers to the benefit of the Land Act of 1881. Under Mr. Smith's motion, he said, it would be five weeks before any Irish question would have a chance to be heard.

He therefore moved "that the rules of procedure be so amended as to enable the Government to do as they please." Continuing he said he was not disposed to surrender the interests of Ireland in order to give the Government precedence for their procedure proposals. The motion had been sprung on the House suddenly in defiance of the fact that there were no precedents for such an interruption of the debate on the day of the day.

Mr. Smith said that the motion was sufficient to show how useless it was to go further into the Irish question until the rules of procedure were settled.

A division was taken on Mr. Parnell's motion and it was rejected by a vote of 242 against 107. The announcement was received with cheers by the Conservatives. Mr. Smith announced that the Government would begin giving precedence to the rules of procedure on Monday.

The Speaker then suggested the putting of the question on the address. Arthur O'Connor moved to adjourn on the ground that the Government had not given precedence to the rules of procedure.

Mr. Smith opposed the motion. Mr. Bradlaugh supported it, saying that he sympathized with the Parnellites. The motion was rejected by a vote of 242 against 107.

After a short debate had been made to continue the debate on the address, the Speaker said it was evidently the sense of the House that the motion should be put. The motion was carried—249 to 74—and the address was adopted.

In the divisions Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington voted with the Government. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107. The Government's donkey was defeated by a vote of 242 against 107.

HOW UNGER KILLED BOHLE.

THE STORY TOLD IN THE WITNESS-BOX.

HE SAYS HE ACTED IN SELF-DEFENCE—HIS DAUGHTER SENT OUT OF THE COURT-ROOM.

The throng of morbid curiosity-seekers, who for three days have crowded the court of Unger and Termer and passed through the comparatively dull proceedings of the trial of Captain Edward Unger, are amply repaid yesterday for their presence. The defendant related the sickening details of his crime with a minuteness and certain dramatic force which made the stoutest-hearted shudder.

The defence called Inspector Byrnes as the first witness, and the first question asked by Mr. How was: "You know your duties well, Mr. Inspector. Did you by any third of the incidents obtain a confession from Edward Unger?"

This was objected to by Mr. Nicoll and the objection was sustained. Mr. How asked if the prisoner made a confession of his own free will; this was objected to on the ground that the confession was not introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross-examine Inspector Byrnes, and a conversation was introduced by the prosecution. Counsel for the defence contended that as Officer Alonzo had testified that he knew that Unger had made a confession to the Inspector the confession was admissible. Judge Barrett coincided in this view and the confession which had been written by and sworn to before Sergeant Mangin, of Inspector Byrnes's staff, was admitted and read to the jury.

Mr. Nicoll proceeded to cross